



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## Synopses of Important Articles.

---

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.—XVII. The Election of Israel.  
By REV. PROFESSOR A. B. BRUCE, D.D., in *The Expositor* for June,  
1894, pp. 416-429.

The success of his work among the Gentiles was a source of grief to the apostle ; for it either signified the canceling of Israel's election, or proved that his gospel was untrue because rejected by the mass of the elect people. In answer to such representations, he argues, first, that the rejection of Israel is *not* impossible. But rejection does not imply a complete rejection, for there was always an election within the election. And, further, in electing acts, God is free ; that what he sovereignly begins, he may sovereignly end. This argument from sovereignty was stated in its bold, unconciliating form because Paul was dealing with proud men who thought the election of their fathers gave them a prescriptive right to divine favor. And, again, that if Israel were rejected, it was her own fault. The apostle charges Israel with an ambition to establish a righteousness which they can regard as their own achievement. Secondly, the rejection is not final. The apostle is moved by patriotism and by hope that is inspired by his own conversion. He lays stress on the mere fact of election, which, he argues, cannot be lightly recalled without loss of dignity to God. Next, the inner circle of the elect is shown to be not an inconsiderable body. But still, with respect to the great majority of Israel, are they doomed to stumble or fall irretrievably? No ; for salvation has come to the Gentiles to make unbelieving Jews feel envious at the loss of divine privileges. The ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of Romans, in which this line of thought is found, were never intended as a contribution to theological controversy. Their theme is the election of a people and not of individuals. Election is pictured as not simply to favor but to function in behalf of others. This was the purpose of the election of Israel. "All Israel shall be saved," he boldly avers, taking courage from Old Testament texts which seem to point that way. The mystery of the future is the ultimate softening of Israel's hard, impenitent heart, so that she shall be willing to be united with converted pagans in one great fellowship of faith, and hope, and worship.

---

Such profound exegesis as this is very stimulating and robs Paulinism of much of the narrowness that has been so long attributed to it ; and, instead of discovering material for men to debate and take sides on, lays bare the truly fundamental facts of God and religion.

C. E. W.

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.—XVIII. Christ. By REV. PROFESSOR A. B. BRUCE, D.D. *The Expositor* for July, 1894, pp. 32-46.

Paul's conception of Christ's dignity was closely connected with his faith in Christ as the Redeemer. The doctrine of Christ's person is the outgrowth of religious experience, the offspring of the consciousness of personal redemption. Paul's vision showed him Jesus as the Christ. The crucified Christ is then seen to be a vicarious Savior, whose character of vicariousness extended to his whole earthly career. Jesus' whole earthly experience was a long course of self-humiliation, and the redemption he achieved was a redemption by self-humiliation. This involved pre-existence in the form of a moral personality capable of forming a conscious purpose. Jesus' relations to man, the universe, and to God, are, (1) he came into the world by birth, but he knew no sin. His resurrection constituted him the Man from Heaven. He was a real man; a Jew, with Hebrew blood in his veins, and possessing Hebrew idiosyncrasies; but is called, in sharp antithesis to the Adam who caused the fall, the last Adam made into a quickening spirit. (2) As to his relation to the universe, Christ is represented as the firstborn of all creation, the originator of creation as well as its final cause. (3) The titles most often applied to Christ are the Son of God and the Lord. One important element in this doctrine of sonship is that the relationship is ethical in its nature, that is, because of his preëminent measure of the Holy Spirit. But more than the ethical is intended, for Christ is "His own Son" and the "image of God," to which we are to be conformed. As to whether Paul thought of Christ as God, the much disputed passage in Romans 9:5 seems to leave the question in doubt, while the benediction at the close of the Second Corinthians would seem to favor the assumption.

C. E. W.

---

THE STUDY OF COMPARATIVE RELIGION IN OUR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES. By WM. ELLIOT GRIFFIS, D.D., in *The Homiletic Review* for October, 1894. Pp. 297-304.

The apostle Paul is our example in his missionary activity, and he made himself familiar with the religious ideas of those whom he addressed. Experience and observation show that it is wiser and cheaper to train intending missionaries in the knowledge of the habits of mind and feeling of the non-Christian peoples to whom they go. Discipline is necessary in missionary effort as in any other kind of warfare. A field should be chosen and studied. This kind of study is embraced in the science of comparative religion Christianity's own child. There is much material collected to serve as the basis for work. Some ten institutions of learning in America are already offering opportunities for students in this department. The three lines along which study must go are the following: (1) the gathering of the facts, in order to know the history of religion. Ethnology is fundamental, on which

the histories of special religions must build. (2) Philosophizing on the basis of these facts. Such work shows the wideness, and yet the unity of religious phenomena. It gives the missionary sympathy, and opens to him a common ground with his hearers. (3) The comparison of religions comes last and on the basis of their history and philosophy. Without this preliminary training, it is misleading to make such comparisons. This work is just beginning to be done with safety and success. But the preacher at home will be benefited by studying comparative religion (*a*) in developing an enthusiasm for humanity, (*b*) in facing without dismay the facts of ethnic faiths, and interpreting them in the light of the Word of God as well as correcting and enlarging the current theology and local religious thinking in their light, (*c*) in disclosing the absolute truth of the rightfully apprehended Word of God.

---

This article ought to set some people to thinking, and stimulate others to keep on thinking, and to turn thought into action. We wish that the writer had allowed his thoughts to clarify a little and had put them in a more orderly fashion. He would then have made a stronger impression. Doubtless the necessity for condensation has caused the omission of much more that might wisely have been said. G. S. G.

---

"POWER ON THE HEAD." [I COR. 11:10]. By REV. PROFESSOR A. ROBERTS, D.D., University of St. Andrews, in *The Expositor* for August, 1894.

This passage has been the despair of interpreters. Most attempts at its interpretation do violence to the term *ἐξουσίαν*, replacing it by some term like *ἐξιοῦσα*, *ἐξ οὐσίας*, *κανσίαν*, etc. Often interpreters do equal violence to the expression *διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους*, by substituting other forms or words that give a supposedly more intelligible meaning. But all these conjectures and emendations are worthless. The text is undoubtedly correct.

Paul's thought in the context is not that there is an *essential* inferiority in woman, but that there is a certain *order* in the sexes; man being the glory of God; woman, the glory of man. This fact of subordination is used by Paul to correct a tendency on the part of the women in the church at Corinth to confuse the position of the sexes by laying aside their veils. For the veil in many ancient nations was the symbol of subjection. If a man, therefore, goes to an assembly with his head covered, he appears to subject himself to a woman instead of to his proper head, Christ. But if a woman presents herself in public uncovered, she dishonors her head, the man, by claiming an equality with him, thus in effect throwing aside her modesty.

But this might lead us to expect in vs. 10 some such expression as *emblem of subjection*, instead of *authority*. Authority, however, refers not to man's dignity, but to something that belongs to the woman, *i. e.*, the rightful claim that woman, in her proper place, has to influence and honor. By

her acceptance of her God-assigned position of subordination to man, she has gained a dignity not to be acquired by any foolish attempt at independence. The veil and long hair are emblems of this dignity or authority.

The expression "because of angels" has no reference to Gen. 6:2, but the thought is suggested that the holy angels are present in the religious assemblies of the Christians. The remembrance of this fact should prevent disorderly conduct.

---

This interpretation is not altogether new, although reached by independent study. It, perhaps, represents the possible meaning of the passage as satisfactorily as any other, but it will hardly meet all objections, especially in the relation of the second clause to the entire thought of the chapter. So far as ridding Paul of the charge of severity towards women, it is less equivocally successful. S. M.

---

DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY OF ASCRIBING DEUTERONOMY TO THE SEVENTH CENTURY, B. C. By F. WATSON, in *The Thinker* for September and October, 1894. Pp. 207-214, 301-307.

Kuenen's position that a law book, as having a more practical aim, must take account of the actual circumstances of the times in which it is written, and hence is a better reflection of its own times than is expected in a prophetic book, is admitted as applying to a book of human law, but the application of such a principle to a divinely given law book cannot be granted, because such a book, while indeed it keeps in view the human circumstances of those to whom it is given, yet aims at an ideal above and beyond the actual practices or even possibilities of its own time, for only thus can it accomplish its object of elevating the people. To say, therefore, that Deuteronomy is a reflection of the religious condition attained in the seventh century, B. C., can argue nothing more than that the nation by that time had at length arrived at the ideals set for it in early times.

But granting Kuenen's principle as applicable, even to a divinely given law book, it is proposed to show that Deuteronomy does not in fact reflect the condition of Israel in the seventh century, B. C., and that, too, though written so largely in that prophetic style in which in the prophets we find many of our most valuable references to local and temporal circumstances.

Israel's history and character between 700 B. C. and 600 B. C. are well known. The book could hardly have been written in the century after Hezekiah without some incidental reference to Assyria and Sennacherib's overthrow. For if in the plan of the book, which precluded reference to present times, there could be an allusion to Solomon, as some hold, why not also to Sennacherib. And again, to warn against Egypt and ignore Assyria, if the purpose was to counteract heathen influences, would be inexplicable in a book written during the Assyrian invasions. If, however, it is admitted that Deut.

28:49 is a description of the Assyrian army, as some hold, it is inconceivable that the writer should stop at that point.

If Solomon may be alluded to for picturing the evils of monarchy, it would be strange that an author in the times of Hezekiah should not seize upon him as an example of a good king and take the opportunity to show how prophet and king (Isaiah and Hezekiah) should work together. It seems impossible then that the book should have been written in the days of Hezekiah.

The expressions of abhorrence of idolatry and its attendant crimes in Deuteronomy give no adequate picture of the terrible and hopeless condition of the nation under Manasseh. So far as it speaks of these abominations, it is too calm, and confident, and hopeful. The sins guarded against are sins that may come in the future, not such as are actually in practice. The law of the kingdom would have been very different if Manasseh's reign had been in view.

Nor was the book composed under Josiah, for making all due allowance for the hope that people saw in the character of the young king, his character, at the time the book must have been composing, was not yet tested, and it was a time of painful uncertainty, in view of the attitude of the powerful neighboring nations. Yet at a time when prophets both true and false made free to give the king political advice of all sorts, this book, so largely prophetic in character, has no special counsel to give to a king in Josiah's difficult position. It thus appears that, historically, the book of Deuteronomy does not reflect the times of Hezekiah, Manasseh, or Josiah.

We next have the doctrinal argument. It is true that Amos and Hosea and even first Isaiah and Micah show little or no trace of Deuteronomy, while Jeremiah is full of it, and Zephaniah and Ezekiel also were evidently influenced by it. But what are the inferences to be drawn from this? It may be inferred without question that Deuteronomy preceded Jeremiah, but where Deuteronomy and the earlier prophets are so independent of each other, no inference can be drawn as to which is older since the argument will work equally well both ways.

But it is said that Deuteronomy shows traces of a more advanced stage of religious development than these earlier prophets. This the writer of the article denies on several grounds. Deuteronomy indeed spiritualizes the ceremonial law, but the earlier prophets have already left the ceremonial law behind. Deuteronomy speaks of God's watchful care over Israel, the prophets of his providence and rule as universal. There is no Messianic teaching in Deuteronomy as in Isaiah, and Jehovah's relation to Israel is not so tender and close as in Hosea. Deuteronomy presents the doctrine of the Holy People as does also Isaiah, but the "holiness" of Deuteronomy is ceremonial and moral only, while that of Isaiah is moral and spiritual.

Finally, the teaching of Jeremiah, though making much use of Deuteronomy and largely imbued with its spirit, is against the theory that he had

any part in its composition or was even cognizant of its preparation, as a man of his position must have been had it been the product of the prophetic priestly party of his time. In the matter of public worship especially, Jeremiah moves on an independent line and could hardly have been a party to the central-sanctuary idea. In other respects, too, he is sufficiently independent to show that while he values the book, he is not an advocate of all its teachings, and therefore could not have had a part in its composition, much less in an attempt to make it as a literary fiction pass for genuine Mosaic legislation.

---

The article is a strong and interesting setting of the principal arguments for an earlier date for Deuteronomy. Its strongest argument is that from the doctrinal teaching, for the strength of the historical argument depends mainly upon the question how far a careful author, with a sufficient motive, can in a literary fiction avoid giving it a coloring from his own time. If the book was produced in the time of Josiah with the purpose that the critics claim, it was essential that it should not reflect the times of Josiah and we cannot say *a priori* that an author could not so compose his work as to accomplish this. For the sake of argument, it is unfortunate that the writer at the beginning, as the conservative writers are apt to do, makes a distinction between human law and divine law. For by thus introducing the distinctly supernatural, he at once takes the subject quite out of the range of argument, since there can be no argument as to how much may or may not be done by supernatural interference. The arguments presented are sufficiently strong of themselves not to need the support of such an appeal to the supernatural, and the candor and temperate tone of the entire article commend it even to those who have reached an opposite conclusion.

D. A. W.

---

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS. By ALBERT REVILLE, in *The New World* for September, 1894.

The essential and permanent element in Christianity is the Christian ideal—filial faith in God, and the brotherhood of man. It is a mistake, therefore, to seek the foundation of the Christian religion in the bodily resurrection of Jesus, historically important as is the belief in such an event. But this belief in his bodily resurrection was not so much the foundation as the result of the faith of the disciples. (1) The comparison of the Gospel narratives discloses hopeless discrepancies and contradictions. The different versions of the women's visit do not agree. The disciples did not expect a bodily resurrection, notwithstanding the Gospels as we now have them contain predictions of the event. In fact, there are to be detected two currents of oral tradition in the Gospel narratives: one, localizing the appearances of Jesus in Galilee; the other, localizing the appearances in Jerusalem. The first is to be found in Proto-Mark, the first Gospel, and the fourth; the second, in Luke 24 and John 20.

The Galilee tradition is not based upon unimpeachable testimony that the

appearances of Jesus were corporeal. Why should there have been those who doubted? To the religious Jews of the period there was nothing improbable in a resurrection. Does this not indicate that according to the eagerness of the anticipation did the apparition seem concrete? And why should the disciples have feared to ask "Who art thou?" knowing that it was the Lord? Further, why should the account of John speak of the lake, and that of Matthew of the mountain?

The Jerusalem traditions have also discrepant features, but this one common element: the disciples get from women the first suggestion of the resurrection. To this group, in addition to the appearances mentioned in the Gospels, belong those mentioned by Paul in 1 Cor. 15: 5-7 (the oldest testimony we possess). But these present more points of difference than likeness. The Emmaus episode, with its succession of feints on the part of the Unknown, as well as the stories of the appearance of Jesus in the upper room, indicate the fear, and the subsequent, though difficult, growth of conviction that marked the attitude of the disciples.

Taken together the two groups of tradition are absolutely irreconcilable. Indeed there seem to have circulated in the primitive Christian communities numerous incoherent traditions concerning the resurrection. But if harmony is impossible, it is possible to disengage the central and fundamental phenomenon of which all these traditions are more or less echoes.

(2) What then is the common phenomenon? Not that alleged by "common rationalism"—a swooning, revived, and hermit Jesus. Jesus certainly died. And then, too, the tomb was on the second day after the crucifixion, found empty. Who took the body of Jesus? Not the disciples, for they did not expect a resurrection. The body of Jesus was stolen and concealed or destroyed by the Jews, very probably the chiefs of the Sanhedrin. Their motive was the desire to prevent his tomb becoming a place of pious pilgrimage for the Galileans. The early Christians, once persuaded that Jesus had risen would not investigate the disposition made of their Master's body. The only exception among the disciples may have been Joseph of Arimathea, who perhaps knowing or suspecting the theft, could not so firmly believe in the resurrection, and therefore disappears from the Gospel narrative.

Not only was the resurrection unexpected by the disciples, but Jesus himself expected neither resurrection nor crucifixion. He suspected danger and tried to guard against it, but he did not deem it fitting to leave Jerusalem during the feast. It was the treason of Judas that changed the order of events. Jesus did not even expect to be arrested at the exact time at which the misfortune occurred. Why did he say to his disciples on the way, "After I have risen, I will go before you into Galilee"? We know that he could not really have been speaking to them of his resurrection. He simply was appointing a rendezvous in Galilee.

Thus the origin of the story of the resurrection was as follows: the women find the tomb empty; intuitively perceive that Jesus was alive; their



mental super-excitement takes form in the shape of angels; they tell the disciples who at first disbelieve, but find the women are correct at least in saying that the tomb is empty; they remember the rendezvous in Galilee and immediately set out thither, profoundly moved by doubt and hope; the sight of the familiar mountains and lake so awake the enthusiasm of some that they seem to see their Master; this ecstasy becomes contagious; after their return to Jerusalem the apostles have apparitions during forty days; the apparitions cease because the mental crisis cannot be prolonged; the last apparition becomes the "ascension." This account is strengthened by the fact that the appearance of Jesus to Paul was subjective, and yet according to 1 Cor. 15:3-8, was of the same general nature as the appearances of the Gospels.

The fact that historic Christianity is thus founded upon an illusion should not cause spiritual depression. The history of the Christian church does not set out from the material fact of the resurrection, but from the faith of the disciples in him who had conquered them morally. The visions themselves contained a profound philosophic truth—they show the prophetic element in man; his immortal destiny; and above all, the feeling of his own immortality inspired in his disciples by the Son of Man.

---

The problem which M. Reville seeks to explain is as complicated as it is vital to Christian faith. Any new light upon its difficulties is to be welcomed most heartily by the student of the New Testament. M. Reville, with considerable acumen, though not always with sufficient freedom from bias, has analyzed our Gospel accounts of the resurrection into component *logia*. But further than this it does not appear that he has added any important element to the final solution of the difficulties involved. His attempt to build the belief in the resurrection upon the theft of the body of Jesus by the Jews has the merit of novelty, but is hardly likely to gain general acceptance. It is inexplicable that if this had been really the case, some charge to that effect should not have appeared in the anti-Christian writings of the Jews. It would certainly have been a most effective weapon against the early church. The exposure of inconsistencies in the Gospels by no means supplies the explanation sought. The great problem of the "common fact" is still to be answered. M. Reville's exposition of this fact reads like those of a generation before Keim, and can have little force with those acquainted with the latter's criticism of similar theories.

S. M.